UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/702,151	11/05/2003	John L. Manuel	200300161-1	7814	
	7590 10/07/200 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER			
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			SEYE, ABDOU K		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2194		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/07/2008	ELECTRONIC	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
		10/702	,151	MANUEL ET AL.			
		Examin	er	Art Unit			
		Abdou I	Karim Seye	2194			
Th Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this commu	nication appears on	he cover sheet with	the correspondence ac	ddress		
A SHORT WHICHEN - Extensions after SIX (6 - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD F /ER IS LONGER, FROM THE N of time may be available under the provision ) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com d for reply is specified above, the maximum s pely within the set or extended period for reply sectived by the Office later than three months ent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF sof 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no munication. tatutory period will apply and y will, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICA' event, however, may a reply will expire SIX (6) MONTHS application to become ABANI	TION.  be timely filed  from the mailing date of this of DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
2a)⊠ This 3)⊡ Sind	ponsive to communication(s) file action is <b>FINAL</b> .  The entils application is in condition accordance with the praction is the practical accordance.	2b) ☐ This action is for allowance exce	non-final. pt for formal matters	·	e merits is		
Disposition o	of Claims						
4a) ( 5)	m(s) <u>1-31 and 33-44</u> is/are pend of the above claim(s) is/a m(s) is/are allowed. m(s) <u>1-31 and 33-44</u> is/are rejection m(s) is/are objected to. m(s) are subject to restriction	are withdrawn from o	consideration.				
<u> </u>	specification is objected to by the	o Evaminar					
10)∭ The Appl Rep	drawing(s) filed on is/are icant may not request that any objected to by the content of th	: a) ☐ accepted or ection to the drawing(sg the correction is req	) be held in abeyance. uired if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 C	, ,		
Priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
2) Notice of D 3) Information	deferences Cited (PTO-892) Braftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( In Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Bry/Mail Date	PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) lail Date mal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 2194

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

1. Claims 1-31 and 33-44 are pending in this application

#### Claim objection

- A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:
  - (i) "The system", Claim 25.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 3. Claims 24-30, 34 and 40-44, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter.
- 4. Claims 24-30, 34 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to computer product, by claiming a computer readable medium in the specification is a paper (see page 8 of the specification, paragraph 31); and paper are not functionally or structurally interconnected with instructions in such a manner as to enable instructions to act as a computer component and realize any functionality they may possess. Thus, the office considers this to be non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2194

5. Claims 24-30, 34 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a computer product comprising: logic configured to receive; logic configured to poll; logic configured to select and logic configured to direct. While not explicitly describing whether these logic are instructions stored on a computer readable medium and executed; therefore the computer product appears to be comprised of software without claiming execution of these logic.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-31 and 33-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Shier et al. (US 7181382)** in view of **Malaviya et al (US 6477520)**.
- 8. Claims 1, 8, 14, 24, 31, 33, 34, 35 and 40, <u>Shier</u> teaches, system, product and method for creating a best-match object at run time, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2194

receiving a request for an object (col. 7, lines 50-54; FIG. 4: 401col. 14, lines 45-50);

polling object proxies, representing the capability of each respective proxy to generate the requested object (Fig. 4: 405; col. 15, lines 7-58); and

directing the selected proxy to create the object represented by the selected object proxy (Fig. 4: 407; col. 15, lines 7-58).

- 9. <u>Shier</u> does not explicitly teach a confidence level and; selecting one of the proxies based on the confidence level.
- 10. <u>Malaviya</u> discloses a confidence level (FIG. 5:36; col. 15, lines 30-51; where a fuzzy object value (low or high or medium) is a confidence level) and; selecting one of the Fuzzy objects/proxies based on the confidence level (Fig. 5; col. 18, lines 10-50).
- 11. It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shier's invention with Malaviya's invention to assign a confidence level to proxy object and poll the proxy object by selecting it based on the confidence level from a group of proxies object. One would be motivated to include a confidence level analyzer for a decision making process for selecting a proxy from a plurality object proxies in order to efficiently calculate true cost of travel in a travel purchasing optimization system (Malaviya's; col. 3, lines 8-28).

- 12. As to claim 2, <u>Shier teaches</u>, wherein the step of receiving a request for an object comprises receiving indicia of a peripheral device (Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 19-35).
- 13. As to claim 3, <u>Shier</u> further teaches, wherein indicia comprises a device identifier (col. 10, lines 33-46).
- 14. As to claim 4, Malaviya teaches, wherein the step of selecting one of the proxies comprises comparing each confidence level with a previously received confidence level (abstract; col. 19, lines 44-64).
- 15. As to claim 5, Shier teaches, wherein the step of selecting one of the proxies comprises storing an index associated with a proxy having a greater confidence level (col. 15, lines 20-26).
- 16. As to claim 6, <u>Shier</u> teaches, wherein the step of directing the select one of the proxies to create the object generates a peripheral device driver (col. 15, lines 1-26).
- 17. As to claim 7, Shier teaches the step of: registering a new proxy capable of creating an object designated for use with a new peripheral device (Fig. 3A; col. 12, lines 20-32).

Art Unit: 2194

18. Claim 19, <u>Shier</u> teaches, wherein the interface is configured to receive a device identifier associated with a printer (col. 1, lines 25-27)

19. As to claims 9-13, 15-18, 20-23, 35-30, 36-39 and 41-44, are rejected for the same reasons as the claims above.

## Response to Arguments

- 20. Applicant's arguments filed on June 12, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 21. In the remarks applicant argue in substance that:
- (1)The combination of Shier, and Malaviya failed to teach the subject matter " a confidence level representing the capability of each respective proxy to generate the requested object".
- 22. Examiner respectfully disagreed with applicant's remark.

As to point (1) the examiner disagrees since, see paragraphs 4-7 above. Shier teaches polling object proxies to generating the requested object (Fig 3A/B; Fig. 4: 407; col. 15, lines 7-58). Malaviya teaches a confidence level (FIG. 5:36; col. 15, lines 30-51; confidence analyzer for data object); and selecting one of the proxies based on the confidence level (Fig. 5; col. 18, lines 10-50). Therefore the combination of Shier and

Art Unit: 2194

Malaviya meet the claimed limitation of "polling object proxies for a confidence level representing the capability of each respective proxy to generate the requested object".

#### Conclusion

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to <u>Abdou Seye</u> whose telephone number is <u>(571)</u> <u>270-1062</u>. The examiner can normally be reached on <u>Mon - Fri, 7:30am - 4pm</u>. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195 Examiner, Art Unit 2194